

REMARKS

Applicants thank Examiner Gortayo and Supervising Examiner Le for the courtesy of a telephonic interview on July 9, 2007. Applicants' representative James J. Barta, Jr. discussed the invention recited in claim 1 and the cited reference to Jerome. In particular, Jerome stores the content from the content providers, and delivers the content upon request to the user. The invention recited in claim 1 represents an improvement over the Jerome reference as it uses less memory and bandwidth. No agreement was reached, no demonstration was given, and no exhibit was shown.

Applicants have thoroughly considered the Examiner's remarks in the March 9, 2007 Office action and have amended the application to more clearly set forth the invention. This Amendment B amends claims 1, 3, 8, 10, 11, 15, 22, and 30. Claims 2, 4, 9, 12, 16-19, 23, 24, 31, and 33 have been canceled. Claims 35-41 have been added. The new claims were added to recite features which are clearly distinguishable over the cited art. For example, claim 35 recites "only" to indicate that the content from the content provider is not stored as in the Jerome reference. Claims 1, 3, 5-8, 10, 11, 13-15, 20-22, 25-30, 32, and 34-41 are thus presented in the application for further examination. Reconsideration of the application as amended and in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Appl. No. 2004/0143667 to Jerome (Jerome) in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,058,671 to Calvo et al. (Calvo). Applicants submit that none of the cited references, alone or in combination, teach or suggest the combination of elements in the amended pending claims.

Jerome teaches a "showcase panel" of advertiser content on a web page. Jerome requires **a content distribution system to store all the content provided by the advertisers**. The showcase panel of content is provided to the user, by the content distribution system, in a web page. The user views the content in the web page, and may select (e.g., via interaction with the displayed web page) links to additional content provided by the advertisers. See Jerome, FIG. 4 and paragraphs [0038], [0039], and [0043].

Calvo teaches a method for delivering dynamic web pages. A view template has data tags instructing where and how to include each record of a query result into a server computer. Queries are performed on a single database. The query results are inserted into the view template to create a web page. The web page is sent to the client. (Calvo, Abstract).

In contrast, the present invention dynamically aggregates content from a plurality of content providers. That is, there is no need for a content distribution system such as in Jerome to store the large amounts of content, and to have the bandwidth to deliver all the content to the user upon request. The reference in the present application *identifies* content from a content provider, with the content being hosted by the content provider. The system in claim 1 enables the content provider to update or modify the content linked to by the reference without having to notify or deliver the content to another system. (See paragraphs [0045], [0046] in the present application). The invention as claimed in amended independent claim 1 includes:

sending the document with the reference to a client computing device, wherein an application program executing on the client computing device then dynamically renders, without input from a user, the document to the user by retrieving the content from the content provider via the reference and displaying the retrieved content in the display area identified by the display area identifier.

In an example, upon receipt of the document, the client computing device (e.g., executing a browser) automatically retrieves the content via the links when displaying the web page to a user, without any user input (e.g., **without the user having to click on a hyperlink**). This eliminates the need for a content distribution system such as in Jerome to store all the content, and represents an improvement over Jerome. In fact, the cited art including Jerome teaches away from the present invention by disclosing a system for *submitting* content for storage by the central distribution server, and by requiring the user to actively select a displayed hyperlink to retrieve additional content. For example, paragraph [0039] of Jerome teaches automatic updating of content provider packets, which includes sending content from the content providers to the content distribution system (NOT the user). See Jerome, paragraph [0043] ("The content distribution system stores the content provider packet and associated demographic profile").

Aspects of the claimed invention enable cobranding on a web site while eliminating the need for extensive infrastructure at a central location for physically hosting elements for the

other sites. For example, claimed aspects minimize the burden of hosting content at a centralized site such as in Giljum, improve the security of cobranded pages, ease the development and debugging of cobranding content, and enable flexible internationalization of cobranding.

Support for the amendments to claim 1 may be found, for example, in FIG. 5, FIG. 6 and paragraphs [0049], [0054], and [0058] of the present application.

The teachings of Jerome and Calvo, alone or in combination, fail to render obvious the subject matter claimed in amended claim 1. To the extent that amended independent claims 8, 15, 22, and 30 include limitations similar to the limitations in independent claim 1, these claims are believed to be allowable for at least the same reason that amended independent claim 1 is believed to be allowable. As such, the rejection of claims 1, 8, 15, 22, and 30 should be removed.

Applicants submit that the claims depending from the independent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons that the independent claims from which they depend are allowable.

Conclusion

Applicants submit that the claims are allowable for at least the reasons set forth herein. Applicants thus respectfully submit that claims 1, 3, 5-8, 10, 11, 13-15, 20-22, 25-30, 32, and 34-41 as presented are in condition for allowance and respectfully request favorable reconsideration of this application.

Although the prior art made of record and not relied upon may be considered pertinent to the disclosure, none of these references anticipates or makes obvious the recited aspects of the invention. The fact that Applicants may not have specifically traversed any particular assertion by the Office should not be construed as indicating Applicants' agreement therewith.

Applicants wish to expedite prosecution of this application. If the Examiner deems the application to not be in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited and encouraged to telephone the undersigned to discuss making an Examiner's amendment to place the application in condition for allowance.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency or overpayment of any required fee during the entire pendency of this application to Deposit Account No. 19-1345.

Respectfully submitted,

/James J. Barta, Jr./

James J. Barta, Jr., Reg. No. 47,409
SENNIGER POWERS
One Metropolitan Square, 16th Floor
St. Louis, Missouri 63102
(314) 231-5400

JJB/cjl